

### REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated October 5, 2006. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 9-10 have been amended, claims 11-22 have been cancelled, and claims 23-32 have been added. Claims 1-10 and 23-32 are currently pending.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 101

Claims 21-22 have been cancelled herein, rendering their disposition moot.

### PRIOR ART CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 6, 11, and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,770,533 issued to Franchi (hereinafter *Franchi*). Claims 3-5, 7-10, and 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Franchi*. Claims 11-22 have been cancelled herein, rendering their disposition moot. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 9-10 have been amended and claims 23-32 have been added in view of the rejections to more clearly characterize and distinguish Applicants' invention from the prior art.

As explained in ample detail in the specification, Applicants' invention is directed to a method and system for generating and managing pull tab games (see specification page 57, para. [00225] *et seq.*, FIGS. 5-17). Applicants' proposed pull tab gaming invention provides a deck and deal organization that is particularly well-suited for remote, hierarchical electronic distribution of pull tabs. To this end, claim 1 has been amended to recite steps of "generating a deck of pull tab tickets that specifies for each of the pull tab tickets, a game theme specifying game outcome display indicia, a number of pull tab lines played, and a ticket index that specifies a game outcome," and "generating a deal of the pull tab tickets within the deck, wherein the deal specifies a monetary denomination and a sequential order of one or more of the pull tab tickets within the deck." Claim 1 has further been amended to address the problem, explained in Applicants' specification at page 11, para. [0037] and page 65, para. [00253], of shuffling electronic pull tab tickets in a manner that complies with legal jurisdictions that prohibit sequentially random or pseudo random (i.e. cannot be computationally predicted) shuffling and which also prevents local gaming operators, such as a game caller, from predicting winning tabs. To this end, claim 1 has been further amended to more specifically characterize the previously

claimed “linear congruential algorithm” feature by reciting a step of “responsive to a purchase transaction for a pull tab ticket within said deck:

shuffling the deck of pull tab tickets using a linear congruential algorithm ...  
comprising the formula:

$$\text{NextTicketIndex} = (\text{Multiplier} * \text{PreviousTicketIndex} + \text{Increment}) / \text{Modulus} ,$$

wherein NextTicketIndex represents the selected pull tab ticket index, Modulus represents a specified modulus value, Multiplier represents a constant associated with the specified modulus value, wherein the specified modulus value is a power of two and is at least five times greater than the number of the pull tab tickets in said deck, PreviousTicketIndex represents the previously issued pull tab ticket index, and Increment represents an odd integer that is uniquely associated to said deal from among other deals within said deck and is less than the value for Modulus.” Ample support for the amendments to claim 1, and similarly for newly added independent system claim 25 can be found in Applicants’ specification, page 65, para. [00253] *et seq.*

*Franchi* discloses an open architecture casino operating system in which decks and deals for casino games are remotely generated (see col. 6, lines 55-57). However, nothing in *Franchi* expressly or inherently discloses or suggests generating a deck of pull tab tickets that for each ticket in the deck specifies a ticket index that specifies a game outcome. Furthermore, nothing in *Franchi* expressly or inherently discloses or suggests utilizing the linear congruential algorithm as specified above.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that *Franchi*, either individually or in any combination with other prior art known to Applicants fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the features of claims 1, 25 and all claims depending therefrom.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to overcome the rejections and pointing out with particularity how the amended claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance of the claims now pending.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at 521.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew W. Baca

Reg. No. 42,277

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

Telephone (512) 343-6116

Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS